Remarks

In the final Office Action mailed February 22, 2008, claims 1-21 are pending, and claims 1-21 stand finally rejected. The Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 8-15, and 17 in this Response. The application stands unintentionally abandoned due a mailing receipt delay during prosecution. The Applicants have included a petition for revival under 37 CFR 1.137(b) and a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR § 1.114 with this Response. The Applicants traverse the rejections set forth by the Examiner.

35 USC § 101 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 8-14 under 35 USC § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicants have amended claim 8 to recite a "computer readable medium" as suggested by the Examiner. The Applicants thus respectfully request withdrawal of the § 101 rejection.

35 USC § 102 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 8-11 under 35 USC § 102 (a) or (e) as being anticipated by US Patent Number 6,603,478 (Kuo).

Claim 1 recites a method for switching fonts without embedding font switches in the data. According to the method, a character is received to be effectively deleted from or modified in a first base font resource. A new font resource is created which includes the received character. The new font resource is linked to the first base font resource to in effect delete the received character from or modify an existing character in the first base font resource. The new font resource and the first base font resource act as if they are a uniform font resource.

The Applicants submit that Kuo does not teach the limitation of "linking said new font resource to said first base font resource to in effect delete the received character from or modify an existing character in said first base font resource" as recited in claim 1. In a previous Response filed November 21, 2007, the Applicants presented arguments submitting that Kuo does not teach either adding the received character to, deleting the received character from, or modifying an existing character in a font resource. In response to these arguments, the Examiner asserted that the previous claims did not recite an obligatory task of performing all these features

("added to, deleted from or modified in" could be anticipated by a single reference that taught any one of the features). Following this reasoning, the Examiner then presented Kuo as teaching "added to" and asserted that this rendered claim 1 anticipated by Kuo. As the Applicants' previous arguments regarding Kuo not teaching adding the received character to a first base font resource were not persuasive, the Applicants have amended claim 1 in the hope of advancing prosecution by amending claim 1 to recite that the received character is linked to in effect "delete the received character from or modify an existing character in" a font resource. As discussed in the previous Response, the Applicants maintain that Kuo does not teach deleting the received character from or modifying an existing character in a first font base resource, as recited in claim 1.

Kuo discloses a client computer running an application having Asian fonts that is connected to a server. When a specific Asian character is not located within the application running on the client computer, a character request is sent to the server. The server processes the character request, and if the requested Asian character is in a server database, then the server transmits the requested character to the application on the client computer for display. The Applicants maintain that nothing in Kuo teaches that either the client computer or the server is operable to "delete the received character from or modify an existing character in" a font resource, as recited in claim 1. For example, Kuo does not teach linking the requested character to a font resource on the client computer to in effect delete the requested character from or modify an existing character in the font resource on client computer. In addition, Kuo does not teach linking the requested character to the structured database to in effect delete the requested character from or modify an existing character in the structured database.

For at least the reasons provided, the Applicants submit that Kuo does not anticipate claim 1. Similar arguments apply for claim 8. Dependent claims 2-4 and 9-11 are novel for at least depending on novel base claims 1 and 8.

35 USC § 103 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 5-7, 12-14, and 15-21 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuo in view of US Patent Number 6,603,478 (Flowers). The Applicants submit that Flowers does not alleviate the weakness in Kuo as discussed above, and that dependent claims 5-7 and 12-14, which depend on base claims 1 and 8, respectively, are non-

obvious in view of the combination of Kuo and Flowers. Independent claim 15 and dependent claims 16-21, are non-obvious in view of the combination for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

The Applicants maintain that claims 1-21 are novel and non-obvious in view of the cited art, and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all outstanding rejections and allowance of claim 1-21.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **March 5, 2009**   **/Sean J. Varley/**

Sean J. Varley, Reg. No. 62,397
Duft, Bornsen & Fishman, LLP
1526 Spruce Street, Suite 302
Boulder, CO 80302
(303) 786-7687
(303) 786-7691 (fax)
Customer Number: 50441